

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-3 are pending in the application, and that claims 1-3 are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1-3 have been amended and new claims 4-6 have been added. Thus, claims 1-6 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Objection to the Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of informalities. The abstract has been rewritten to emphasize that which is claimed in the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits the amended Abstract as germane to the instant invention claimed; and withdraw of objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner has indicated that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the Examiner has requested that all structure claimed in claims 1-3 (metal coated with liquefiable substance, shorting out opposite poles of the same power source, receiving groove around the cross panel, heating process, etc.) must be shown. To best show the cross-sectional figure of the metal and coating with appropriate hatching is needed.

Best Available Copy

A new set of drawings has been produced and herewith submitted to include the specific figures teaching the claimed subject matter; and enhanced with a requested cross-sectional view added to the original three dimensional isometric figure displaying the electronic seal around the door of a protected containment, per the Examiner's request. No new matter has been entered, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested. In addition, the specification has been amended accordingly.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 are objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the claims as indicated by the Examiner in the above manner for both objections and rejections and submits herewith. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baggott US 2,662,045. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baggott discloses a system for bonding comprising thin metal strip 13 coated with plastic resin 12 that melts when current is applied to the metal strip.

Best Available Copy

However, the present invention is not the same as Baggotts' bonding metal strip. Claim 1 has been amended to remedy any confusion. Baggott is merely a joint sealing system. In contrast, the present invention comprises, for example in at least one embodiment, the use of a thin wire or flat piece of metal imbedded in plastic at the manufacturing point with a security chip to establish a future detectable access point in an electronics package. In the present invention, any such seal is to be activated at a later point via a specific signal that results in a specific appearance from an authorized entry for tamper detection reasons-when activated. The present invention is not merely creating a "secure joint" between materials as described in Baggott. In addition, Baggott is analogous to a standard hot glue or hot melt. Accordingly, in the present invention, the security can be as simple as a single wire embedded in a plastic package wall at manufacture or set in an access panel groove as displayed when used in combination with the remaining elements being claimed, when each claim is interpreted as a whole.

To summarize, Baggot is talking about a strong physical bond- **not a security seal**. Baggot's CS switch does not stay with the sealing foil conductor or product. It is connected to the transforming power unit and only connected to the sealing foil through connection tabs at the time the seal is made. (Baggott, Column 3 Lines 33-51). As indicated above, in the present invention, in at least one embodiment, a security trigger circuit is connected and imbedded with the security seal wire as a security seal system, and optionally stamped in the seal wells by authorized users to further determine tampering or improper entry.

Best Available Copy

Applicant has amended claim 1 hopefully in a manner that satisfies the Examiner to allow applicant to traverse the rejection to claim 1 and also any transferred objection to dependent claims 2 and 3. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. IN addition, Applicant has added new claims 4-6 that Applicant provide collateral and/or the appropriate protection that Applicant is entitled to receive.

Resubmission of PTO-1449 Form Sheet 1 of 2

Applicant is resubmitting the PTO-1449 Form Sheet 1/2 with a stamp date of January 27, 2005. The Examiner appears to have inadvertently not initialed the prior art references listed in the "Foreign Patent Documents" section. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that, as described above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. Applicant does not concede that the cited prior art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, Applicant has provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

Applicant strongly emphasizes that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples Applicant has described herein in connection with distinguishing over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, Applicant asserts that it is the combination of elements recited in each of the claims, when each claim is interpreted as a whole, which is patentable. Applicant has emphasized certain features in the claims as clearly not present in the cited references, as discussed above. However, Applicant does not concede that other features in the claims are found in the prior art. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Applicant is providing examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Applicant wishes to clarify for the record, if necessary, that the claims have been amended to expedite prosecution. Moreover, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original subject matter recited in the present claims in a continuation application.

Best Available Copy

Any narrowing amendments made to the claims in the present Amendment are not to be construed as a surrender of any subject matter between the original claims and the present claims; rather merely Applicant's best attempt at providing one or more definitions of what the Applicant believes to be suitable patent protection. In addition, the present claims provide the intended scope of protection that Applicant is seeking for this application. Therefore, no estoppel should be presumed, and Applicant's claims are intended to include a scope of protection under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Further, Applicant hereby retracts any arguments and/or statements made during prosecution that were rejected by the Examiner during prosecution and/or that were unnecessary to obtain allowance, and only maintains the arguments that persuaded the Examiner with respect to the allowability of the patent claims, as one of ordinary skill would understand from a review of the prosecution history. That is, Applicant specifically retracts statements that one of ordinary skill would recognize from reading the file history were not necessary, not used and/or were rejected by the Examiner in allowing the patent application.

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and that such action is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

In the event that an Extension of Time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an Extension of Time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that Extension of Time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an Extension of Time or credit any overpayment for an Extension of Time to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



Irah H. Donner
Registration No. 35,120

399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
TEL (212) 230-8887
FAX (212) 230-8888

Date: 10/12/05
IHD:cj